

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action of December 29, 2005 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the drawings because Figure 2 was allegedly missing. However, a brief review of the image file wrapper on the U.S. PTO web site indicates that Figure 2 has, in fact, been received by the U.S. PTO as a portion of the application. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner objected to the abstract due to the inclusion of legal terminology. In order to address this objection to the abstract, and in order to make various additional editorial corrections, the entire specification and abstract have now been reviewed and revised. However, no new matter has been added. Due to the extent of the revisions, a substitute specification and abstract have been prepared and submitted herewith. In addition, a marked-up version of the original specification and abstract, indicating the changes made thereto, has also been prepared and submitted. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the substitute specification and abstract, and to withdraw the objection to the abstract.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 15-25 as being unpatentable over the Bladen reference (GB 2,169,492) in view of the Baker reference (US 4,433,885); and rejected claims 4-10 as being unpatentable over the Bladen reference in view of the Rock reference (US 4,090,753). However, the Examiner also indicated that original dependent claims 11-14 and 26 contain allowable subject matter. Thus, as indicated above, the original claims have now been cancelled and replaced with new claims 27-52, including new independent claims 27 and 51. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the new claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

As an initial matter, new independent claim 51 has been drafted to include the subject matter of original base independent claim 1 and original allowable dependent claim 11. Therefore, in view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, it is respectfully

submitted that new independent claim 51 and the claim that depends therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

New independent claim 27 is directed to a drawer that comprises two drawer frame members, a rear wall, a drawer bottom, and a front facing panel adjustably attached to the drawer frame members. The front facing panel includes at least two panel portions *adjustable relative to one another* and arranged so that the front facing panel is angled inwardly. The arrangement of the front facing panel as recited in new independent claim 27 is described on page 2, line 25 through page 3, line 20 of the original specification. Because the front facing panel includes at least two panel portions that are *adjustable relative to one another*, the horizontal gaps between adjacent drawers can be precisely adjusted as desired.

The Bladen reference discloses a corner unit and a drawer therefore, including an outer edge 25. However, the outer edge 25 has a one-piece construction and does not include at least two panel portions adjustable relative to one another.

The Baker reference discloses a lazy susan assembly that includes two door panels 22a and 22b. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the door panels 22a and 22b are “adjustably connected together.” In this regard, column 4, lines 28-35 explain that a rotary catch mechanism 40 serves as a means for aligning the rotary position of the door panels 22a and 22b *with respect to the cabinet 10*. However, the Baker reference does not disclose or suggest a front facing panel including at least two panel portions *adjustable relative to one another*.

The Rock reference discloses a fastening device including a retaining part 4 and a support part 5 which can be adjusted relative to each other. However, the Rock reference provides no motivation for producing a front facing panel including two panel portions in which the panel portions are adjustable relative to one another. In this regard, it is well established that the mere fact that references *can* be combined does not render the resulting combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. See *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this regard, although the Rock reference teaches that it is possible to provide a fitting that might allow two separate components to be adjustable relative to one another, there is no suggestion provided by this reference to arrange two panel portions of a

front facing panel so that they are adjustable relative to each other as recited in claim 27, and the prior art references of record do not teach the desirability of this arrangement.

As explained above, the Bladen reference, the Baker reference, and the Rock reference do not, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a front facing panel of a drawer in which the panel includes at least two panel portions adjustable relative to one another. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify or combine these references so as to obtain the invention recited in new independent claim 27. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new independent claim 27 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Helmut FITZ

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 27, 2006